

lost their lives on United Airlines Flight 93, American Airlines Flight 77, American Airlines Flight 11, and United Airlines 175.

We must recognize that we were unsuspecting of this disaster. Therefore, our pledge to those who still mourn—those who have lost their father, mother, husband, wife, child, or friend—as we debate these serious times is we are reminded that there must be no one that terrorizes us and causes us to do the wrong thing.

Whether we are Republicans or Democrats, I ask that on this day we hold a moment of personal silence, one that will reflect our love for those who were lost. Then, to take the words of George W. Bush, the President at that time:

Whether terrorists are brought to justice or justice is brought to the terrorists, justice will be done.

A firm hand, yes; but we must be reminded of the humanitarian aspect of this and realize that, as we stand with the President and debate our further steps, we honor those who are in mourning. Let's remember 9/11 as a tribute to the Americans who sacrificed their lives.

I mourn this day.

Mr. Speaker, on this, the 13th anniversary of the attack launched against the United States on September 11, 2001, I rise to remember the victims of that horrific tragedy and those first-responders who risked, and in too many cases, sacrificed their lives to rescue the occupants of the besieged World Trade Center Towers.

The morning of September 11, 2001 is, and will always be, a day like no other. It is a day all living Americans will remember because not since Pearl Harbor had there been such a dastardly and deadly attack on American soil.

As I stand here today, my heart still grieves for those who perished on flights United Airlines 93, American Airlines 77, American Airlines 11, and United Airlines 175.

When the sun rose on the morning of September 11, none of us knew that it would end in an inferno in the magnificent World Trade Center Towers in New York City and the Pentagon and in the grassy fields of Shanksville, Pennsylvania. I stand here remembering those who still suffer, whose hearts still ache over the loss of so many innocent and interrupted lives.

My prayer is that for those who lost a father, a mother, a husband, a wife, a child, or a friend will in the days and years ahead take comfort in the certain knowledge that they have gone on to claim the greatest prize, a place in the Lord's loving arms. And down here on the ground, their memory will never die so long as any of the many of us who loved them lives.

Mr. Speaker, as hard as it is to believe, out of a tragedy so overwhelming and horrific, something good and great emerged in the aftermath of September 11. On that day there were no Republicans or Democrats. There were no Northerners or Southerners or West or East Coasters. We were not Red State or Blue State. We were all simply Americans.

On that day, we were united in our shock and anger and sadness. We were united in our resolve to defend our country and protect

the freedoms that has made America the greatest country in the history of the world.

We lit candles, held hands, helped neighbors, and prayed for our country and its leaders. A united America can never be defeated as Operation Enduring Freedom showed.

The brave and valiant armed forces of the United States swiftly toppled the Taliban and liberated Afghanistan.

As President George W. Bush announced to the American people and to the world: "Whether the terrorists are brought to justice or justice is brought to the terrorists, justice will be done."

And though he ran and hid for almost ten years, Osama bin Ladin could not hide forever and evade the long arm of American justice, which, under the leadership of President Barack Obama, caught up with him on May 2, 2011.

Mr. Speaker, Americans take care of their own. Americans cherish freedom. Americans cherish liberty. And Americans want peace. Not just for themselves alone, but all persons in every corner of the globe.

Mr. Speaker, ensuring that America is safe and secure and protected from another attack on American soil is the least we owe to the heroic passengers on Flight 93 and to the brave firefighters of the FDNY and officers of the NYPD and the officers and civilians we lost in the Pentagon who gave faithful service to our nation.

I believe all Americans want their country to remain safe, free, and invulnerable to another cowardly attack like the one we witnessed thirteen years ago today.

We owe that much to the Americans who lost and gave their lives. We owe it to them to ensure that their children and loved ones will never again experience such pain, suffering, and loss.

We can do this. We must do this. After all, we are Americans.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO 9/11 VICTIMS

(Mr. YOHO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the innocent victims who lost their lives on September 11, 2001.

Thirteen years ago today, our homeland was attacked. Evil manifested itself in the form of extremists who murdered 3,000 Americans. Our world and America was forever changed by the tragedy that unfolded in New York; Washington, D.C.; and Pennsylvania.

The evil that came out of the shadows in 2001 still exists today in 2014. If left unchecked, it will continue to grow for the foreseeable future and threaten us once more. Now, more than ever, we must remain vigilant in the defense of our great country and against those who wish America harm. We can no longer afford to be divided into Republicans and Democrats, conservatives and liberals. We must come together today, from this point forward, as Americans.

Today, let us pause and pray in remembrance of those who fell on 9/11 and for all who continue to stand in harm's way at home and abroad.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably delayed in a security briefing on the issues dealing with the terrorist group ISIL and I missed the vote on the motion to recommit on H.R. 3522, the Employee Health Care Protection Act. If I had been present, I would have voted "aye."

TERRORISM ACROSS THE GLOBE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to my dear friend from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND).

HONORING S. TRUETT CATHY

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I come before you today to honor one of Georgia's greatest: Mr. S. Truett Cathy.

Truett Cathy was known across the globe as a successful businessman, author, and the "inventor of the chicken sandwich." Mr. Cathy would also say, "God created chicken; we created the chicken sandwich." But most importantly, he was a beloved great-grandfather, grandfather, father, and husband, above all else. His strong Christian faith could be seen in everything he did. It didn't matter if it was his company, his employees, or his generosity. It was all embodied in the love and good news of Jesus Christ.

Truett's whole life was about giving hope and opportunity to those who had none. His dedication to helping children who have been abused and lost in the foster system reflected how important family values were to him and are only a fraction of what Truett, a man of such great integrity, was able to accomplish.

Having come from nothing himself, he wanted every child to have the same chance at success and happiness as he did. Truett established the WinShape Foundation, which includes 11 long-term foster homes for 95 children. The WinShape Foundation helped not only children in bad circumstances, but for all periods of an individual's life.

Truett also used his foundation as an opportunity to show you that faith in God can help you through your journey by providing opportunities for young adults to reconnect with their faith in the college program, offering retreats for married couples to renew their love in each other and in God, and creating our next generation's leaders through Christian wilderness camps to learn how to be a better leader and a part of a team.

Truett believed building Christian leaders shouldn't be limited to our country's borders and took WinShape International through missionary trips and projects in over 43 countries.

The generous work and humble spirit of Truett Cathy has touched more lives

than we could ever imagine, and many successful individuals today have him to thank.

Even in business, Truett Cathy treated his Chick-fil-A employees like family, endowing a scholarship foundation to help send them to college. Chick-fil-A has actually awarded more than \$25 million in the last 35 years, done through \$1,000 scholarships to 20 or 30 hardworking and deserving employees every year.

□ 1345

Through all his work, Truett gave the most important gift of all to many underprivileged children and teens, and that is hope.

You can never put a price on having someone believe in you and give you a chance at success by giving you your first job and teaching you the value of respect and hard work, and what the ethics of being employed was all about.

Truett sums up his life mission and his work best himself:

Nearly every moment of every day, we have the opportunity to give something to someone else, our time, our love, our resources, and I have always found more joy in giving when I did not expect anything in return.

Having the opportunity to know Truett and his wonderful family has been a privilege, and I thank him for all he has done for the people of Georgia and across this Nation, for the hope and confidence that he has given so many young people to continue on and to fight for what they believe.

Joan and I want to send our condolences and prayers to the Cathy family during this time of great sorrow for us all.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank the gentleman. I do appreciate that tribute to a truly great man.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN), my friend, for such time as he may consume.

Mr. HULTGREN. I want to thank my good friend from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the complexities of our Nation's health care system on the eve of the first open season since ObamaCare was launched.

I want to offer a hope to the millions of American consumers who still need real solutions to help ensure that their families can obtain necessary and affordable health care.

Today, our health care system in America has two faces. It can provide state-of-the-art care while, at the same time, can be one of the most complex and frustrating systems in the world.

Americans feel the effects of these complexities every single day. They repeatedly put health care near the top of their list of issues that concern them, and they should be concerned.

The system today has so many conflicting incentives, rules, and regulations, that few Americans have the ability to make sound and affordable decisions for themselves and their fam-

ilies. ObamaCare introduced a whole new level of fuzziness to an already opaque system.

Families are increasingly worried that they will pay more and more for health insurance that covers less and less and lowers the quality of care. They search for long-term economic security, but find unsustainable costs instead.

Even with the advent of the President's health care law, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, also known as ObamaCare, many middle class Americans haven't found their health care to be more affordable, nor have they felt secure with the current system.

Americans have a right to feel frustrated with the Affordable Care Act today. It is far from what they were promised.

I have heard stories from too many of my constituents who received letters terminating their coverage, like Julia, from Gurnee, Illinois, or of others facing rising health care costs, like another who told me: "I wonder if the administration ever thought about those of us who have to pay for our health care coverage with no extra help, and how much more we would be paying."

Or of the employers who have had to eliminate health benefits, or of workers and teachers whose hours have been reduced because employers can't afford the higher premiums, or of families losing access to doctors they have known for decades.

Those doctors also face conflicting rules that result in adverse consequences. They want to continue to provide care, but many are no longer accepting Medicare patients and must now require upfront payments for care just to keep their practice open.

There aren't enough doctors and specialists to go around in the narrow networks. We have tried to address the long and sometimes life-threatening waits for veterans. Now is the time to address those long lines for everyone else.

Surely, this is not the health care system we were promised, nor does it paint a bright future for the health status of Americans. That is why, on August 28, I convened the third Community Leadership Forum in Illinois' 14th Congressional District. Our topic? Health care. Our focus? The consumer.

I assembled three separate panels to discuss issues ranging from the ACA and how it will continue to affect consumers in 2015, to how technology and innovation can improve health care outcomes, to how best to increase consumer access to and quality of health care. It was clear that there was a thirst for the community to come together.

In the weeks preceding the forum, I was excited to hear about the panelists' enthusiasm. The forum included CEOs of local and statewide health care organizations and hospitals, CMOs and executive vice presidents of insurance companies, and, most importantly, my constituents.

I heard about the issues directly affecting every level of our health care system. Most importantly, our focus remained on offering consumer-oriented solutions. Never before had I been confronted with such passion and desire to offer answers for our national health care system and work together to implement solutions.

Today, I want to share just a selection of the great ideas that could help American consumers of health care. Many of these will be available in a full report I plan to release on my Web site, hultgren.house.gov, in the coming days.

During the first panel, one of the primary challenges health care and small business insurance professionals discussed was how to ensure consumer choice and access to the broader market of providers. I heard numerous times about the need to reduce health care costs overall by pursuing a market-based system with less regulation.

Surprisingly, the only sub-industry in health care that is lowering costs and increasing the quality of care is elective procedures, an industry perpetuated by market control.

Insurance providers told me the difficulties they face operating within the ACA's demands and slim margins. Certain insurance regulations, like the medical loss ratio, exacerbate costs. These costs translate directly into higher premiums for constituents and businesses.

Instead of encouraging higher quality of care and lower costs with advancements in technology and economy, we find ourselves moving in the opposite direction. Relieving these ineffective and inefficient mandates could be a first step to opening up more options for insurers and consumers.

In the second and third panels, I heard from hospital executives and university innovators about the biggest challenges facing medical technology and innovation.

With innovators and leaders in the biotechnology and medical technology industry at the table, I learned about the ever-present and insurmountable "valley of death," the period of time between a potentially lifesaving device or product discovery and its introduction to the broader market. This period is encumbered by regulation and bureaucracy.

In Europe, devices and medicines that show promise are approved and brought to market faster and more effectively.

To help with technology transfer and to quicken innovation and its application, I learned about ways to fill the gap between discovery and investment. Legislation like the TRANSFER Act, introduced by my colleague, Representative CHRIS COLLINS from New York, will help reduce the strain caused by the valley of death in the innovation process.

Another method is the preservation of the Bayh-Dole Act of 1980. One speaker recommended fully funding the

FDA to speed the approval process to bring new devices to market in the United States.

The conversation went so far as to talk about the intersection of education policy and scientific research, highlighting the need to make sure our kids receive the best STEM education our schools can provide. These conversations clarified that medical innovations are a vital component to strengthening treatments and reducing the costs in the health care system.

Throughout the day, it was confirmed again that the current health care landscape is rocky and uncertain, but there are many who are willing and eager to work together to tackle these challenges.

The House is also eager to work hard to help fix our health care system. Numerous times the House has said “yes” to fixes and alternatives that address our system’s deep challenges. We don’t need to wait for our health care system to get worse before it gets better. We can work to fix it now.

Americans have a right to feel frustrated with the ACA today. It is far from what they were promised. But that should only spur us onward.

We are only months from the start of open enrollment, November 15. The question is, can all of us, in Congress, in health care, and constituents, work together to bring much-needed reform to our health care system? Can we raise the quality of care our country offers while lowering costs for Americans across the country?

I believe we can, and I trust these solutions will help get us there.

I want to thank my good friend from Texas for yielding me time.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, there is so much at risk right now in this country, and the President gave us a fine address last night, very interesting. I know some people say, you know, in times of trouble, when the United States is threatened, we need to all get together behind our leader.

As someone once said to me about Republicans, he said, I just wish the Republicans would all run the same play together. And I responded, I agree. I wholeheartedly want for the Republicans to all run the same play together at the same time.

But I said, the trouble is, if my leader calls a play running to the wrong end zone, I am not blocking for him. And that is also, I think, applicable with the President of the United States.

I was blasted after statements on FOX News saying that if the President wanted to go to war with ISIS, I would support that. So I was anticipating something last night that would unite us and not divide us.

To relate, one of the problems with the President is, he starts off early in his speech saying, as Commander in Chief, my highest priority is the security of the American people. Well, I have come to know friends, close friends with a number of the family

members of Ty Woods, Glen Doherty, Sean Smith, and Ambassador Chris Stevens, and they debate, they don’t believe that the highest priority of this President is the security of the American people.

The actions of this President, in saying that he cares so deeply about the security of the American people, don’t seem to resonate when you stand by weeping parents who have watched their son’s head be cut off by these enemies, and you say it is your highest priority to protect the American people, but they are wondering, that same day that you spend 5 or 6 hours playing golf, do you spend that much time figuring out a way to protect other Foleys?

That is a tough sell.

The President said, now, let’s make two things clear. ISIL is not Islamic. No religion condones the killing of innocents.

Well, that has certainly got to be a shock to the radical Islamists who brutally kill, behead, maim innocent people in the name of what they say is their religion.

In fact, the American people don’t seem to be sold on what the President said. This story from CNN filed at 8:15 a.m. this morning by Ashley Killough quotes what the President said about ISIL’s not Islamic. No religion condones killing of innocents.

Then they have a number of tweets. According to the CNN article, Twitter just lit up with responses to the President saying that. Lots of retweets.

Let’s see, from Ron Christie: “ISIS isn’t Islamic? What kindergartner briefs the President on terrorism?”

Another: “Obama: ISIL is not Islamic? He just countermanded anything he plans to say tonight. Right there is the fatal flaw.”

Another: “ISIL is not Islamic? Hello? THIS ISIL, ‘Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant?’”

Another: “ISIL is not Islamic and Lois Lerner and the IRS is not corrupt. Obama is such a freaking”—Well, Mr. Speaker, I can’t say that word. JOE WILSON said that and it was found not to be appropriate.

Another: “ISIL is not Islamic? Is he kidding? I suppose those black flags are just for giggles then.”

Another from the CNN article: “ISIL is not Islamic—POTUS opens a section aimed at motivating Muslims around the world to disown ISIL, aid U.S. fight.”

Another from Mohammed Ansar: “ISIL is not Islamic, says prime time @BarackObama (and virtually every Muslim and reasonably educated person on the face of our planet).”

□ 1400

Michael Oleaga: Some folks on Twitter didn’t understand Obama’s “ISIL is not Islamic” statement. Study foreign affairs, folks, or religion—all religion.

It is interesting because President Obama’s statement is apparently similar to the historic reaction that Thom-

as Jefferson had before he was President when he was negotiating with the radical Islamist Barbary pirates in northern Africa, who had been capturing American ships—killing, enslaving, holding people for ransom.

Jefferson was rather shocked when he reportedly indicated, “I don’t understand why you keep attacking us. We don’t have a navy. We are not a threat to you.”

It was explained to him, “We believe if we are killed while attacking infidels like you, then we will go instantly to paradise.”

Jefferson is perplexed, and he ends up getting his own copy of the Koran because he couldn’t believe that any religion would ever promote going to paradise for being killed while killing innocent people. He read for himself, and history can tell you exactly what his conclusion was.

As President, he ultimately decided that the only way to deal with these radical Islamists was not to keep paying 10 to 20 percent of the American budget for ransom to get people back.

The solution was to send this new group called the United States Marines to the shores of Tripoli to fight the radical Islamists with everything they had until they yelled “uncle” or were wiped out, and they ceased to come after Americans.

The President says:

I have insisted that additional U.S. action depended upon Iraqis forming an inclusive government.

That strikes me as strange because if the Commander in Chief’s highest priority, as he said at the start of the speech, is the security of the American people, then it begs the question: Why is he so worried about what the Iraq Government does if he knows he has to do something to protect the American people?

Now, I remember Senator Obama repeatedly went after the Bush administration. It seemed that he thought little or nothing of the coalition that President George H. W. Bush put together with 43 countries to go in and liberate Kuwait and that he thought even less of the 49 countries that put people and money on the line to support the effort in Iraq—49 countries.

President Obama thought that was not a real coalition, yet they put people, and they put money. Now, magically, since he is President, he thinks a coalition of nine countries that he won’t name or commit what they are going to put into the coalition is somehow better than the 49 countries’ coalition that President Bush put together before going into the Middle East.

President Obama said:

In June, I deployed several hundred American servicemembers to Iraq.

He goes on to say:

We will send an additional 475 servicemembers to Iraq.

He has made very clear he is not going to put boots on the ground, as he said, in Iraq, so the only conclusion

logically that you can make from the President's saying, on the one hand, we are not going to put boots on the ground in Iraq and that he has already sent several hundred soldiers and is sending 475 more, is that those thousand or so U.S. soldiers will be wearing sneakers.

He said that America will be joined by a broad coalition of partners. It is hard to believe that nine people who are a bit timid about being named and committed to what they will do are really that broad of a coalition.

He said "mobilize partners wherever possible to address broader challenges."

Mr. Speaker, as we have heard from General Kelly, testifying before the House and the Senate—he is the commander of SOUTHCOM, the Southern Command—he knows what threats are to our south. As he testified, the penetration of our southern border by the criminal networks and radical Islamists, in his words, is an existential threat to the United States.

You have got the man who is supposed to know the most about the southern border and protecting us, telling Congress that the penetration going on of our southern border is a threat to the very existence of the United States of America.

So I would urge the President, Mr. Speaker, when he says he will "mobilize partners wherever possible to address broader challenges," to change that word in his teleprompter to read "border" challenges, so that we can protect ourselves from the criminal networks and the potential for radical Islamists who want to destroy us from coming across our southern border.

I truly hope that the late Tom Clancy was not as clairvoyant in one of his last novels as he was in the early nineties, when he wrote about someone who was irritated with the United States flying a jet into the Capitol to wipe out a joint session of Congress.

I love George W. Bush, but when he said "who would have ever thought somebody would use a plane for a bomb and crash it into a building," I was thinking, well, Tom Clancy several years ago, as that was in one of his novels.

In one of his recent novels, one of his last, he wrote about a coalition beginning to form between radical Islamists and drug cartels in Mexico and ultimately a deal where they brought in—I can't remember—10 or 12 radical Islamists with surface-to-air missiles.

They paid tremendously to the drug cartels to smuggle those into the United States, so they could get themselves in vans and, at the appropriate time in areas all across the country, step out and shoot down American passenger planes.

We know that although the radical Islamists are really insane—crazy—when it comes to the killing of innocent people, they are not stupid. When we give them an opening to come after us, they will take it. The President lost

further credibility last night at a time when he really needed to be getting the world behind him.

Credibility was lost when he said:

It is America that has rallied the world against Russian aggression and in support of the Ukrainian people's right to determine their own destiny.

Mr. Speaker, people around the world—as I have traveled in west Africa, north Africa, the Middle East, moderate Muslim countries in the Middle East, Afghanistan, Europe—all understand that this President has done virtually nothing to help Ukraine.

They haven't rallied the peoples of the world, and when the people around the world hear that, they have to think: What? Does he think we are crazy ourselves?

You go back and see what this administration did in response to the invasion of Ukraine by Russia, and the response was a Twitter campaign. They actually did try to put restrictions on, as I recall, 10 or 11 bank accounts that the Russians laughed about.

This President needs to do more to rally the world around us—with us—against radical Islam, against imperialism, like we have seen from Putin, and we can all stand together.

After the President seemed to indicate that he wanted to take out ISIS—or he said "ISIL"—I really felt that when the President had finished last night, that I would be saying that that is something I have got to support, that I am with him. ISIS has said they are a threat to us. We need to take them seriously. They are cutting off American heads. We have got to take that seriously.

Yet when I hear the President, he wants to give support to the moderate, vetted Free Syrian Army; and we read the article from Patrick Poole, where he quotes one of those vetted, moderate Free Syrian Army brigade commanders, saying that his forces were working with the Islamic State and Jabhat al-Nusra, al Qaeda's official Syrian affiliate—both U.S.-designated terrorist organizations:

We are collaborating with the Islamic State and the Nusra Front by attacking the Syrian Army's gatherings in . . . Qalamoun.

Then a quote from another Free Syrian Army commander—vetted, moderate—that this President is going to help:

We have reached a point where we have to collaborate with anyone against unfairness and injustice.

Let's face it: the Nusra Front is the biggest power present right now in Qalamoun, and we as FSA would collaborate on any mission they launch as long as it coincides with our values.

I really expected to be standing today and saying we need to get behind the President's activity, just as I said in the last couple of weeks, immediately after the President's speech, that I agree, and let's go to war with ISIS; but with the President's wanting to continue what he has been doing for over a year—giving weapons to the

Free Syrian Army which somehow, magically, keep having them taken away by the Islamic State—or ISIS/ISIL—the President finally suspended giving them more arms in December.

This President kept sending arms to the vetted, moderate Free Syrians, and they ended up in the hands of ISIS every time, so it was suspended in December. Then in April, for some reason—they think they can now trust the Free Syrians—he started sending more weapons to the Free Syrians, and magically, they keep ending up in ISIS/ISIL control.

This President does a speech last night, and now, we are supposed to get with him and send more weapons to the people whose leaders are saying publicly, "We support ISIS. We support al-Nusra. We support the enemies of the United States."

I yield to my friend from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND).

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for doing this Special Order and for giving me an opportunity to come down and not only listen to him, but to share a little bit.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we could have learned a lesson from Libya in the fact that we gave air support to the rebel groups that were overthrowing Qadhafi, who wanted Qadhafi gone.

Was Qadhafi a good man? No, but his enemies were the same as our enemies, and he had really turned over his nuclear arms, his chemical weapons. I mean, he had stopped with his nuclear enhancement and had turned over his chemical weapons.

□ 1415

Yet we saw fit that we would help the rebels because of humanitarian reasons and what was going on.

You know, sometimes different sides get blamed for different things by just saying, "Oh, we didn't do that. Somebody else did that."

It was interesting that after Qadhafi was gone, all of a sudden, it becomes a wild west in Libya, and as a result of that, we had four brave Americans lose their lives in Benghazi because we were trying to play nice and be friends. Some people don't want to be our friend.

In fact, as the gentleman from Texas was talking about, the real ambition of these jihadists, these radical Islamic groups, is to really have shari'a law control the world.

They want all of us to be under the shari'a law, and that is what their goal is. In fact, if you look at ISIL, the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, they want to go back in history and put together this caliphate that would include Israel, Lebanon, Turkey, and others. I mean, that is their goal.

For people who might get confused with ISIS, ISIL, Daesh—there are a lot of different names that this group is called. I think ISIL is the best because I think that describes their intent of gaining this area that was once held.

So I think we have to really think about this, as far as who we are going to train and arm. Do we know who these groups really are, as the gentleman from Texas read about the article that Patrick Poole had.

We have had fighters that went to Syria. In fact, we just had our first American fighter that was fighting for ISIL. I believe his name was Mr. McCain. He lived in Minneapolis. He went back to San Diego and finally ended up in Syria. I think Josh Earnest used in one of these press briefings that these moderate forces had killed Mr. McCain and that they were fighting both ISIL and Assad.

Now, the interesting thing about this moderate opposition group that killed Mr. McCain is that they killed other ISIL fighters too. They beheaded six of them. Now, I don't know how moderate that is, but according to American standards, that is not moderate.

So I think we really have to give some close scrutiny to these folks that we are going to arm, that we are going to give different weapons. We really don't have a list of what those weapons would be yet. We are going to let the military train them.

We trained the Iraqi military, their police, their defense force for, what, 7 years, I guess, or longer; and then at the first sight of combat, they left the American equipment that they had been given and fled. So I don't know what kind of training we are going to give these moderate groups, but I know we haven't got 7 years to stop ISIL.

So I agree with my friend from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT), that I wish the President had used some different words rather than "degrade." Maybe "destroy"—maybe "defeat" would have been a great word to use, that we want to defeat them.

If you read open source reports, there are 10,000, and then you hear, "Well, now there are 15,000." Then we have got people in the government saying, "Well, they could be up to 30,000. We don't know how many there are."

I promise you, whether it was 30,000 or 50,000, we have got the greatest military in the world, and we could have controlled that situation if we just had the fortitude and the guts to do it, but because of the indecisiveness of this President, this thing has festered.

If we had gone into Syria originally—or at least armed the opposition forces then—we actually knew who they were because they were a small group. There is probably over 100 different opposition forces, and as the gentleman said, they are fighting both Assad and ISIL.

Now, to me, it is really confusing over there about who is fighting whom. If you look at Hamas and the Lebanese Army teaming up with them in Arsal to drive out the rebels that Assad had driven into Lebanon, it is very confusing about who is on whose side.

We need to be particularly aware of that and make sure that we have a vetting process—if it is even possible—that we have a vetting process to make

sure that these people are worthy of getting assistance from the American taxpayer.

Mr. GOHMERT. I would like to ask the gentleman a question, if he has time for one, because I am struggling a little bit.

Byron York has a good article out, published last night at 11:46, where he points out that there are some real potential problems. He says "five things that could go horribly wrong with Obama's action in Iraq." One of them, he mentions the lack of a status of forces agreement.

We all know that President Bush had been working on a status of forces agreement. He thought he would leave it to the President to accomplish that great task and have instant international credibility for signing a document immediately like that coming into office, but for whatever reason—we hear a lot of different stories—but it blew up, but the President says that we couldn't leave troops there without a status of forces agreement because you can't have troops in a country where you don't have, for example, an immunity agreement, so that American soldiers, American contractors that are there to help protect Iraq from harm—sometimes, bombs go off in the wrong place. Sometimes, somebody gets killed that wasn't meant to because it becomes a war zone.

As the President pointed out before, we couldn't leave troops there because we have no immunity agreement. Well, I haven't heard that there is any immunity agreement with Iraq, and yet he announced last night that he has already got several hundred American sneakers on the ground over there and is going to add 475 more troops—apparently wearing sneakers because there are not boots on the ground.

So I am needing some help here. Why is it safe to send in American troops now without the promise, the agreement of immunity from Iraq when it was not safe to do so when he took office? I am struggling here.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Well, and you should. People claim it is all Bush's fault or that it was all the prior administration's fault that this happened.

By the withdrawal of our troops—because I am telling you, I think President Bush laid it out pretty clear in 2007, when he made that speech about how a lot of people in Washington were clamoring about getting our troops out, and he said, "We are not going to get our troops out until our ground commanders in Iraq tell us that we are ready to get our troops out."

He points out the dangers of that, and that is exactly what happened. I think if this administration had understood that and had actually listened to the former President, who had been involved in all the things that had gone on recently in the Middle East, then they would have been persistent enough to persuade Maliki to allow for some agreement.

Now, you know, I don't understand all the politics that have gone into this, but I think last night he authorized another 475 sneakers on the ground, and I think there was already roughly, what, 900-and-something over there.

So we have a lot of guys over there, but we don't know what they are doing, and I don't know that they know what they are doing.

What are the rules of engagement? Are they carrying weapons? Are they carrying notebooks, iPads? What are they doing? I mean, these are some of the most well-trained people that we have in our military. These are valuable assets to us that are over there, and just from the reports I read, I don't see that they really have any operational plan that they are going with.

So that has got to be really confusing, I would think, if I was over there, as to what the rules of engagement were and, you know, if I was going to be sent out as an adviser or as protection, security forces for the Americans that are there, Erbil or Baghdad or wherever they are, so I think it is confusing to them too.

I think that that is the reason, as you mentioned in one of your speeches today that I heard, about the resolution, so we can actually define what we think and what our committees think would be a good military plan for going in and what the expectation was of any forces that we have over there, whether it is air or some of these boots on the ground.

Let's clarify that and make that a separate vote.

Mr. GOHMERT. I think it is worth pointing out what concerns many others in the world, and that is the judgment of this administration.

As we travel around the world, we have allies who talk to us privately, leaders in countries in the Middle East, moderate Muslims, people in Israel, and they keep asking about the judgment of this country, of the national leaders.

Everybody knows that this President agreed to release five Taliban terrorists complicit with murder, and the statement has come out on August 27—this is after the release of five Taliban murderers by this administration. This statement has gone out, and it is in their language. The translation says, in part, "We consider ISIS and every other Mujahedin group as our brothers."

That is kind of important to understand when he released the Taliban Five—who don't have a problem with cutting people's heads off or friends cutting people's heads off, they support ISIS—and the President did so in violation of the law.

It required that there not be one dime of American money spent to release somebody from Guantanamo unless the law was complied with, and the law required a notice of 30 days to people in Congress, and that didn't happen.

He broke the law in order to help the lawbreakers. So people around the world see that, and they are puzzled, and I happened to be standing here on the House floor with one of the two other people that went to the FBI disclosure. They classified it, which I thought was ridiculous.

We wanted to see the documents that the FBI and their advisers on Islam had purged from the FBI training materials. Now, these are the materials that train FBI agents—the kind of people that have to go talk to Tsarnaev and his mother and people at the mosque and friends—who have to know the questions and what to look for that might indicate that this person has been radicalized.

□ 1430

Now, since they classified those materials they purged, we went through them, but we don't get to disclose what is in them. But I can say I was shocked at how ridiculous some of the purging was. Some things were purely from—well, some of them were so clearly important, that people trying to learn about radical Islam, it is important that they know and understand.

So, once you understand that there has been that kind of purging of material, then you begin to understand how this administration could get two—not one, two—heads-up from a country like Russia that Tsarnaev was radicalized, he could kill people, you better watch him, you better check on him, he is dangerous, he is going to hurt people, and they do nothing meaningful about it.

As we found out through a hearing in Judiciary, at first Mueller said, We did go to those mosques. But it turns out he said it was on their outreach program. They never went out there to see whether they were radicalized.

And then, we knew at the time—Mr. Speaker, I hold here the articles from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, articles of organization for the Islamic Society of Boston, and the Islamic Society of Boston is the one that organized the two mosques. And the organizing official is a man named al-Amoudi, which was familiar to the FBI Director because, on his watch, although he had helped the Clinton administration hire what were thought to be moderate Muslims in the Clinton administration and he had originally had an agreement to be of assistance to the Bush administration, the Bush administration ultimately finds out he is supporting terrorism. They have him arrested out here at Dulles Airport, and he's now doing 23 years in prison for supporting terrorism. He's the one that organized the Islamic Society of Boston that created the two mosques where the Tsarnaevs went. The FBI didn't even know that a guy they helped convict of supporting terrorism started the mosque that has created terrorists out of more than one person.

There are others that we find out that have had relations with that

mosque that may be a threat. One other thing I want to mention before I yield to my friend. We have a chart—I have had a blowup of this used before, but it points out how many times, as this points out, terminology is important in defining our goals. The 9/11 Commission identifies Islamist terrorism as the threat. The Muslim Public Affairs Council recommends that the U.S. Government find other terminology.

So, in the 9/11 Commission Report, bipartisan, bicameral people trying to take an objective look, they used the term 322 times in the 9/11 Commission Report. However, the last FBI Counterterrorism Lexicon does not include the word “Islam.” The National Intelligence Strategy of 2009 does not include the word “Islam.” In the 9/11 Commission Report, it used the word “Muslim” 145 times, but since then, under this administration, the FBI Counterterrorism Lexicon doesn't use the word “Muslim.” It doesn't use the word “jihad.” It doesn't use the word “enemy.” Now, it does use the words “violent extremism” 29 times. In the 9/11 Commission Report, it uses the word “religious,” and it is normally referencing these radical Islamists. It uses that word “religious” 65 times; whereas, the FBI Counterterrorism Lexicon only uses it three times.

Then the President, basically the only time he used it last night was to say that people that called themselves Islamists are not religious. The people who have had their heads cut off by these people in the name of Islam are looking at what we are doing, I believe, and wondering: How can you say that was not, in their minds, a religious act to cut off my head?

I think, as a Christian, there are references in the Bible. I think people know what goes on here. We know from Scripture that there is rejoicing in Heaven over one soul being saved. Well, how could they rejoice unless they know what is going on? So I think people that have had their heads cut off would have to be wondering about the President's assessment.

“Al Qaeda” was used 36 times in the 9/11 Commission Report, but in the FBI Counterterrorism Lexicon, not used at all. In the National Intelligence Strategy of 2009 under this administration, it is used once. “Caliph,” that is not used at all by this administration in their FBI Counterterrorism Lexicon; National Intelligence Strategy of 2009, the 9/11 Commission Report used it seven times. And it is a little more understandable, too, when you find out that one of the advisers on the Homeland Security Advisory Council that Janet Napolitano put there and gave a secret clearance is named Mohamed Elibary.

There is an article from Adam Kredo, and he quotes a tweet sent out by the Homeland Security Advisory Council member, and the tweet says:

The caliphate will return; that is inevitable.

Well, we know now that the Homeland Security Advisory Council member's tweet has been used by ISIS in recruiting, that even this President's close adviser on Homeland Security that he has secret access to our databases given by this administration, that he is out there saying the caliphate is inevitable. So it is being used to recruit people to kill Americans. The Homeland Security Advisory Council has people helping with recruiting for terrorists to kill Americans.

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND).

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say, when the five of us went in that 12-by-12 room—

Mr. GOHMERT. I think it was three Members of Congress, you, me, and MICHELE, but then there were two FBI agents sitting there, too.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Well, there was one more Member, I know, Trent.

Mr. GOHMERT. Oh, that's right. Trent came, too.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. So there were four of us in a 12-by-12 and two FBI agents and several boxes of paperwork, and they were nice enough to bring one copy so we could share.

The FBI is the greatest. I mean, they are great crime fighters. They do great investigative work. I think it was probably under great political pressure that they purged these documents to take those words out of it. Like you said, even the 9/11 Commission did that.

I want to go back to what you said about our allies and indecisiveness, if I could.

LOUIE, we look at what is going on in the country and we all talk to small business people every day, and they go: You know what? We are not going to expand our business. We are not going to grow because we don't know what our health insurance is going to be; we don't know what our energy cost is going to be; we don't know what the regulations are going to be. So it is kind of a stalemate. I think that is the way our allies look at us. They don't know what our next move is. So, with all this uncertainty, there are different elements that are coming in and filling that void in us being the world leader—Russia being one of them, coming in to fill that void.

People like to know that there is a leader somewhere that they can follow. I just don't think our allies in this world have seen that. Now we have actually got Germany and France and others leading different parts of these charges where America should have been out in front of it.

I know our time is just about up. I want to thank my friend from Texas for allowing me to share with him. I look forward to doing some more of the Special Orders with him and making sure we can get the truth out.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I have another article that accentuates what my friend from Georgia was saying about our allies not being sure what we are going to do. Unfortunately, our enemies seem to know very well what we

are going to do. It is an article published by Al Bawaba, published today. It says—we've identified Hezbollah as a terrorist organization. Well, the deputy leader of Hezbollah, Sheikh Naim Qassem, has said:

"The flurry of international activity, which is sponsored by the U.S., is not serious in ending the takfiri threat . . . He said Obama spoke of 'containing' the threat and not 'stopping' it."

I am quoting from him.

"Comments made by Barack Obama are clear. The word 'contain' means to identify risks and disable some of its objectives while maintaining this terrorist organization's role to frighten certain countries in this region and to keep this risk as a scarecrow in appropriate places to make political gains, particularly in Iraq and Syria."

Our enemies know that this President's speech last night indicated he's not serious. We have got to get serious.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROTHFUS). Members are reminded not to engage in personalities toward the President.

STATEHOOD FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today, because on Monday a very important hearing, the first of its kind in two decades, a hearing on statehood for the District of Columbia will take place in the Senate of the United States.

The hearing is called by Senator CARPER, the Chair of the Jurisdictional Committee. This hearing takes place at a time and in a season when we have seen unusual progress for statehood for the District of Columbia.

□ 1445

In the Senate, the majority leader himself became a cosponsor of the bill and indeed announced it with great energy, which is very unusual because the majority leader of the Senate cosponsors very few bills. The top Democratic leaders are sponsors of the bill. The bill has more House and Senate sponsors than it has ever had. Together this is normally seen as momentum, Mr. Speaker.

Now, when I say we are having the first Senate hearing in two decades, it is not because we haven't tried to get a Senate hearing or because a Senate or House hearing on statehood was what was on the agenda for each immediate period. The District of Columbia residents have tried many ways to get their equal rights to other American citizens. There has been a House Voting Rights Act. I would have the vote on the House floor as I speak had an

amendment not passed that sought to wipe away all the gun laws of the District of Columbia. There have been bills for House and Senate votes. There have been bills for budget autonomy, and we are still seeking budget autonomy.

Through all of this, we have always sought statehood for the District of Columbia because, Mr. Speaker, there is no way for the District to get the same rights that every other American has without statehood. I will go into that a little later.

The Senate hearing is entitled: "Equality for the District of Columbia: Discussing the Implications of S. 132, the New Columbia Admissions Act." That is the companion bill to my bill here in the House, H.R. 292.

I want to take a moment to thank Senator TOM CARPER, who is the new chair of the committee of jurisdiction, the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee. As you might expect, that committee has a lot on its plate, and, yet, in only his first term as chair, Senator CARPER has made many strides forward and always has been very helpful to the District of Columbia, and now culminates the work that he and I have done in the Senate with a hearing. It is a hearing that we, of course, requested, but it is a hearing that he had to be willing to do and find time for on a very busy agenda. I cannot thank Senator CARPER enough in the name of the people of the District of Columbia for affording us the opportunity to be heard.

We do not pretend that statehood is around the corner. We do know this: that if we do not continue to use vehicles like hearings to put the matter before the House and the Senate, and before the people of the United States, we cannot build to the point where we can achieve what we will achieve, statehood for the 650,000 people who live in the Nation's Capital.

When I say this is the first hearing, I do want to say that Senator Joe Lieberman, who was the prior chairman of the Senate Homeland and Governmental Affairs Committee, was also a great champion for statehood. And while he didn't have a hearing, he introduced a bill for statehood that achieved the majority of committee votes. And indeed there was a hearing for statehood when my first bill, the bill when I first came to Congress in the early 1990s, came to the floor and we got the first and only vote for statehood for the District of Columbia. There was a Senate hearing. It was not a jurisdictional hearing. And that is what this hearing is, and therefore it is a landmark hearing. It is a historic hearing. And that is why I felt it merited my coming to the House floor today.

On top of the momentum that we have now seen in the Senate, I shouldn't leave the subject without mentioning the momentum that has been here in the House. We have Republican and Democratic support for

budget autonomy for the District of Columbia, for example. That is a very essential element of statehood, that is, your own budget, your own local funds, and nobody gets to look at it but you, your own jurisdiction. That is not what the District has now. That is what some Republicans and most Democrats believe we should, indeed have.

There is not yet the kind of support for statehood that I expect to see in the House of Representatives, but we will be glad to work with the Senate and the House when it lives up to its own principles that every American is entitled to be treated equally in the Congress and in our country.

Quite aside from the progress we have seen in the House and the Senate on statehood and on the particular elements of statehood, we now have the formal endorsement of the President of the United States for statehood.

I would like to quote what he said when he endorsed the bill:

I have long believed that folks in D.C. pay taxes like everybody else, they contribute to the overall well-being of the country like everybody else, they should be represented like everybody else. It is not as if Washington is not big enough compared with other States. It is absolutely the right thing to do.

I will have something to say about the population of the District of Columbia as compared with other States in a few minutes.

Now, of course, I wasn't surprised that the President of the United States supported statehood. The reason I wasn't surprised is because he has long supported and been on record as supporting all of the elements of statehood: budget autonomy, the right of the people of the District of Columbia, who raise \$7 billion, to spend their own money without coming to this Chamber, which has raised not one penny of it. He has long supported that and has put budget autonomy in his own budget. Legislative autonomy so that the Congress doesn't have some say over the District of Columbia's laws, the President has put that in his own budget. And the President, going back to the time that he was in the Senate of the United States, supported voting rights for the District of Columbia.

So there you have it, voting rights, legislative autonomy, and budget autonomy, the elements of statehood. We have Members of this House and of the Senate who have long supported all of them. We want to bring it all together with support of statehood for the District of Columbia. So there will be then a historic hearing at, I believe it is 3 o'clock on Monday afternoon with witnesses who are particularly able to speak to the issues.

Professor Viet Dinh of Georgetown Law School, a professor of constitutional law, a former U.S. assistant attorney for legal policy in the Bush administration. That made him the highest legal policy official in the Bush Justice Department. He has previously testified here in the House about the constitutionality of the D.C. House